

REMARKS

Claims 11-14 and 16-18, and 20 are pending in the application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the Amendment and remarks submitted herewith.

Claims 11-14 and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bowers (US 4,675,561). "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the * * claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claim 11-14 and 16-18 include the following limitations: "a pad to which an input signal is externally input; a source follower circuit including a transistor having a gate connected to said pad and a source for producing an output signal, said gate is separately provided from said pad." The Examiner asserts that Bowers discloses those limitations, including that the pad is represented by number 88 on Figure 7. Applicant respectfully traverses.

The component that the Examiner refers to as the pad in Bowers is actually a gate electrode. See column 5, line 11. Thus, the feature of the present invention is not disclosed in Bowers. Moreover, the claimed limitations require both a pad and a gate and that the gate is separately provided from the pad. Bowers does not teach those limitations since Bowers only teaches a gate electrode 88.

Claims 11-14 and 16-18 include the following limitation: "an island region on the upper surface of said semiconductor substrate containing impurities of a second conductivity type, and the pad formed on said island region via an oxide film." The Examiner asserts that the pad is located on island 90 in Bowers via an oxide film. Applicant respectfully traverses.

First, as explained above, Bowers does not teach or suggest the pad. Thus, Bowers does not teach or suggest a pad on an island region. While the Examiner asserts that the island region is represented by number 90 in Figure 7, there is nothing located on p+ implant 90 that would represent the pad. Accordingly, Bowers does not teach or suggest this additional limitation.

Thus, Bowers does not disclose all of the claimed limitations of claims 11-14 and 16-18. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowers in view of Choi et al. (US 4,700,461). For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Amgen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

The Examiner asserts that because Bowers meets all of the structure of the claimed limitation and Choi teaches that use of JFETs, the combination of the two references meets all of the claimed method limitations. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 20 includes the following limitation: “controlling a charging amount of a parasitic capacitance by changing the input signal, wherein controlling said charging amount of said parasitic capacitance further comprising connecting a source follower circuit to a pad and connecting an output terminal of said source follower circuit to an island region disposed between said pad and a semiconductor substrate.” (Emphasis supplied.) None of the cited references teaches the method of controlling a charging amount of a parasitic capacitance.


First, as explained above, Bowers does not teach or suggest a pad and thus, the Bowers does not teach or suggest “connecting a source follower circuit to a pad.” Bowers only teaches a gate electrode. In addition, at most, it is inherent that there is a parasitic capacitance in Bowers. Bowers certainly does not teach controlling a charging amount of a parasitic capacitance. In addition, Choi also does not remedy these deficiencies. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants’ attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: 

Lisa A. Bongiovi

Registration No. 48,933

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

55 Griffin Road South

Bloomfield, CT 06002

Telephone (860) 286-2929

Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Customer No. 23413

January 2, 2004